

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

EDWARD VAN HORN, #49115-019,

Plaintiff,

v.

JAMES WALTON, et al.,

Defendants.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 12-11880  
DISTRICT JUDGE GEORGE CARAM STEEH  
MAGISTRATE JUDGE MARK A. RANDON

**ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION**  
**FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL WITHOUT PREJUDICE**

Plaintiff, who is proceeding *pro se*, previously filed a motion for appointment of counsel on May 8, 2012. (Dkt. No. 4). On June 15, 2012, this Court denied Plaintiff's motion. (Dkt. No. 15). Before the Court is Plaintiff's second Motion for Appointment of Counsel. (Dkt. No. 34). Plaintiff says:

[i]t is apparent that the [m]otions that Plaintiff has submitted to this Court lacks clarity and actual case law content. If in fact Plaintiff's [m]otions were determined by this Court to have appropriate content, they would be accepted by the Court and not terminated. The complexity of this case involves not only [c]ivil issues, but [c]riminal issues the defendants are allegeded[sic] to be aware of by Plaintiff.

(Dkt. No. 34 at 2). While Plaintiff may disagree with the Court's rulings, the Court finds Plaintiff's motions are written with sufficient clarity for the Court to make a determination on whether they should be granted or denied. In addition, Plaintiff has not been charged with a crime.

Therefore, the interests of justice do not require appointment of counsel at this time.

Plaintiff's second motion for appointment of counsel is **DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE**.

**IT IS ORDERED.**

s/Mark A. Randon  
MARK A. RANDON  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

Dated: September 25, 2012

*Certificate of Service*

*I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served on the parties of record on this date, September 25, 2012, electronically.*

s/Melody R. Miles  
Case Manager to Magistrate Judge Mark A. Randon